

STATE OF MAINE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 1999-291

June 2, 1999

BELL ATLANTIC - MAINE  
Request for Approval of  
Interconnection Agreement with  
US West Interprise America, Inc.

ORDER APPROVING  
INTERCONNECTION  
AGREEMENT

WELCH, Chairman; NUGENT and DIAMOND, Commissioners

---

In this Order, we approve an amended interconnection agreement between New England Telephone and Telegraph Company d/b/a Bell Atlantic - Maine (Bell Atlantic) and US West Interprise America, Inc., pursuant to section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

On April 30, 1999, Bell Atlantic filed a negotiated interconnection agreement with US West Interprise America, Inc., pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252, enacted by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Interconnection agreements provide for interconnection between an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) and another telecommunications carrier, including a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC). An interconnection agreement may allow a telecommunications carrier to purchase unbundled network elements, or local services at a discounted wholesale rate (the discount reflecting avoided cost), or both, from an ILEC (or CLEC).

On May 12, 1999, Bell Atlantic filed a First Amendment to that agreement, replacing one section (29.9) of the agreement filed on April 30, 1999.

The agreement filed by Bell Atlantic incorporates a blank Schedule 4.0, titled "Network Interconnection Schedule." That Schedule is apparently intended to set activation dates on which traffic between Bell Atlantic and US West Interprise America, Inc. will occur to implement the agreement. We note that the schedule is substantively blank. When the parties agree on a time frame to implement the filed agreement, they should file a completed Schedule 4.0 as an amendment to the agreement we approve today.

US West Interprise America, Inc. will pay to Bell Atlantic the interconnection prices contained in the voluntary agreement that was reached pursuant to arms-length negotiations between the parties. The pricing standards contained in 47 U.S.C. § 252(d) apply only to arbitration proceedings under section 252(b) and not to

negotiated agreements under section 252(a). Bell Atlantic does not represent that the prices contained in the Agreement are consistent with the section 252(d) pricing standards or with any other state or federal policy.

Section 252(e)(2) states that a state commission may reject a negotiated agreement only if it finds that "the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement" or if "the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity." We received no comments by the comment deadline set in a May 10, 1999 Notice of Agreement and Opportunity to Comment. We do not make either of the findings set for in section 252(e)(2) for rejection, and we therefore approve the agreement.

We qualify our approval in two respects, however, and reserve findings on future potential issues. First, we reserve judgment on whether the rates contained in the agreement are reasonable from the perspective of Bell Atlantic's retail ratepayers. Bell Atlantic is presently under an alternative form of regulation (AFOR) ordered by the Commission in Docket No. 94-123. The AFOR began in December, 1995. Under the AFOR, Bell Atlantic bears the risk of lost revenues resulting from rates that are too low. However, at the end of the initial 5-year period of the AFOR, and in 2005 if the present AFOR is renewed, we may have occasion to review Bell Atlantic's earnings. We do not resolve whether Bell Atlantic is receiving reasonable compensation from any CLECs that may avail themselves of the rates provided to US West Enterprise America, Inc. pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 252(i) and, if they are not reasonable, whether we should impute revenues to Bell Atlantic.

Second, section 271(c) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 271(c), requires that the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) meet certain requirements before they are allowed to provide interLATA service (the so-called "competitive checklist"). Under section 271(d)(3), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) must determine whether the BOC has met the competitive checklist before granting the BOC authority to provide interLATA service within its region. Prior to making that determination, the FCC must consult with state commissions to verify the compliance of the BOC with the checklist. Our approval of this Agreement should not be construed as a finding that Bell Atlantic has met those requirements.

If US West Enterprise America, Inc. wishes to provide public utility services, it must seek Commission authorization to provide those services pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. § 2102, and we will require US West Enterprise America, Inc. to maintain schedules of rates, terms, and conditions pursuant to 35-A M.R.S.A. §§ 304-309.

The agreement filed by Bell Atlantic provides for interconnection between US West Enterprise America, Inc. and Bell Atlantic's network in Maine. If US West Enterprise America, Inc. seeks to interconnect with networks maintained by independent

COMMISSIONERS VOTING FOR: Welch  
Nugent  
Diamond

NOTICE OF RIGHTS TO REVIEW OR APPEAL

5 M.R.S.A. § 9061 requires the Public Utilities Commission to give each party to an adjudicatory proceeding written notice of the party's rights to review or appeal of its decision made at the conclusion of the adjudicatory proceeding. The methods of review or appeal of PUC decisions at the conclusion of an adjudicatory proceeding are as follows:

1. Reconsideration of the Commission's Order may be requested under Section 1004 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (65-407 C.M.R. 110) within 20 days of the date of the Order by filing a petition with the Commission stating the grounds upon which reconsideration is sought.
2. Appeal of a final decision of the Commission to the Maine Supreme Judicial Court, sitting as the Law Court, is not available, as provided in 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(6).
3. Review of this discussion is available to an aggrieved party by bringing an action in federal district court, as provided in 47 U.S.C. § 252(e)(6).

Note: The attachment of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the particular document may be subject to review or appeal. Similarly, the failure of the Commission to attach a copy of this Notice to a document does not indicate the Commission's view that the document is not subject to review or appeal.